.	THE PARTY OF THE P		
1	JENNY L. FOLEY, Ph.D., ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9017		
2	E-mail: jfoley@hkm.com		
3	REX M. MARTINEZ, ESQ.		
	Nevada Bar No. 15277		
4	E-mail: rmartinez@hkm.com HKM EMPLOYMENT ATTORNEYS LLP		
5	1785 East Sahara, Suite 300		
6	Las Vegas, Nevada 89104		
	Tel: (702) 805-8340 Fax: (702) 805-8340		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8			
9	IINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
0	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
		1	
11	DESTINI LAWVER, an Individual,	CASE NO.:	
12	Plaintiff,	Chief ivo	
13		COMPLAINT AND HIDW DEMAND	
4	VS.	COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND	
14	CERTAINTEED GYPSUM		
15	MANUFACTURING, INC., a domestic		
16	Company; DOES I -X; ROE CORPORATIONS I -X.		
17	COM CIGITIONS 1 7.		
	Defendants.		
18			
19			
20	The Plaintiff DESTINI LAWVER ("Ms. Lawver" or "Plaintiff") by and through her		
21	attorneys, Jenny L. Foley, Ph.D., Esq. and Rex M. Martinez, Esq., of HKM Employment		
22	Attorneys LLP, hereby complains and alleges a	as follows:	
	JURISD	ICTION	
23			
24			
25	discrimination based on age, sex, national origin and retaliation under Title VII of the Civil		
26	Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), 42 U.S.C. §2000e et seq.; the Equal Pay Act of 1963 ("Equal		
27	Pay Act"), 29 U.S.C., Chapter 8 sec. 206(d); and for violation of Nevada Revised Statute		
	§613.330 et seq		
28			

- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission wherein she alleged discrimination based on sex, retaliation, and violations under the Equal Pay Act.
- 5. On or about March 29, 2021, Plaintiff received her Notice of Right to Sue from the EEOC.
 - 6. This action is timely filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f).

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

7. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedy on all claims pled hereunder prior to filing this action with this Court.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. Plaintiff incorporates all of the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
 - 9. Plaintiff is a United States citizen and current resident of Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 10. Defendant **CERTAINTEED GYPSUM** MANUFACTURING, INC. ("Defendant" or "CertainTeed") is a Domestic Company and an employer in the State of Nevada.
- 11. At all times relevant to this matter, Defendant had over 100 employees, and is therefore subject to the provisions of Title VII and the EPA.
 - 12. Plaintiff began working for CertainTeed in 2013 as a Laborer in Cody, Page 2 of 10

Wyoming, but she was quickly promoted to Shift Lead at the Cody, Wyoming plant.

2

13.

14.

18.

Manufacturing ("WCM") toolset.

and recruited by Defendant to become their first Production Superintendent, a new position that

Plaintiff was such an exceptional employee that she was specifically sought out

Thereafter, because of Defendant's recognition of Plaintiff's accomplishments

4

Plaintiff was so successful at that they expanded it to other plants.

6

5

in the Production Superintendent role, Plaintiff received unsolicited job postings for other plants.

7

8

9

15. Plaintiff moved to Las Vegas in December 2016 as she was promoted to Production Superintendent.

10

16. Upon Plaintiff's hiring at the Las Vegas Gypsum plant, it was agreed to that

11 12

17. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff requested a salary of \$85,000 per year but

Plaintiff would make a salary of \$80,000.00 per year, with annual raises and benefits.

13

was told there was no room in the budget.

As a Production Superintendent, Plaintiff's work responsibilities included

1415

managing employees, materials, and equipment, supervising all employees in the Production

16

Department, as well as the effective use of the Area Improvement Boards and the World Class

17 18

19. Upon information and belief, Mr. Amand Keller was hired in April 2017 as a

19

Shift Lead and Supervisor at the Las Vegas plant.

2021

20. Upon information and belief, Mr. Keller was promoted to Production Superintendent, the position held by Plaintiff, in approximately September or October of 2018.

22

21. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendant gave Mr. Keller a significant raise of approximately \$8,000 a year before Defendant even approached Plaintiff

2324

about changing positions.

change job titles at the same time.

25

22. Upon information and belief, this meant that Mr. Keller was being paid a significantly higher amount while he held a lower position than Plaintiff.

26

23. While Mr. Keller was getting promoted, the Company proposed that Plaintiff

5

8

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

- 24. During this time, upon information and believe, Plaintiff' also requested that she be paid \$85,000 for the position in accordance with the standard salaries, raises, and bonus that were already being provided to employees at her level or below, including the compensation that Mr. Keller was already being paid and/or offered that amount.
- 25. However, Plaintiff never accepted the new position and never said she would accept it because it never materialized.
- 26. Upon information and belief, Patrick Chambers, Plaintiff's supervisor, told Plaintiff that she would have to vacate her position prior to them hiring Mr. Keller up to fill that position in accordance with corporate guidelines.
- 27. Despite this statement by Mr. Chambers, Mr. Keller was promoted into Plaintiff's position while she was still in it, violating corporate guidelines.
- 28. Nevertheless, despite Plaintiff being offered this other position while being pushed aside for Mr. Keller, there was no proposed pay raise, no written job description, and no specific title proposed for the new position.
- 29. Plaintiff never received an official offer for the new position that was never created, and as such, Plaintiff never vacated her position.
- 30. As Plaintiff remained in the same position, she had the same expectations, job duties, and responsibilities as she was still a Production Superintendent.
- 31. However, at the same time, Plaintiff was being given more responsibilities and she was often expected to do her bosses' job of Production Manager, which included doing their payroll and corporate reporting for them.
- 32. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was informed by Mr. Chambers that there existed a major pay discrepancy between Plaintiff and Mr. Keller, despite being in the same position.
- 33. Shortly thereafter, upon information and belief, Jocelyn Hernandez, an HR Manager, told Plaintiff in approximately January/February of 2019 that the new position would not materialize because Defendant was "not supposed" to have two Production Superintendents.

- 4
- 5 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25 26
- 27
- 28

- 34. During this time, upon information and belief, Plaintiff was not only forced to fulfill her previous contractual obligations, but she was also expected to perform duties outside of her contractual obligations and agreements.
- 35. Ms. Hernandez told Plaintiff that she and Thiago Sposito, the Plant Manager, did not want to "call attention" to the fact that there were two Production Superintendents at the Las Vegas Gypsum plant.
- 36. Similarly, Defendant, upon information and belief, segregated Plaintiff in a distinct work zone without other employees to support or assist Plaintiff.
- 37. Shortly thereafter, Plaintiff, upon information and belief, questioned why she was being ostracized, excluded from union and management meetings, as well as why she was being required to complete Mr. Keller's paperwork.
- 38. Plaintiff spoke with the Production Manager, Andrew Jarvey, in early October 2019 about the fact that Mr. Keller was being paid more and that Plaintiff was covering his work.
- 39. Plaintiff, upon information and belief, specifically stated, "I feel that the only reason I am paid less and treated like a secretary (i.e stuck doing [Mr. Keller's] paperwork and not included in any union or management meetings) is because I'm a woman," or something similar to that effect.
- 40. In response, Mr. Jarvey told Plaintiff that he was not allowed to discuss another employee's salary with her and made it clear that she should not raise the issue again.
- 41. Upon information and belief, Mr. Keller was making approximately \$93,000 per year, compared to Plaintiff who was making approximately \$84,000 per year, despite the fact that Mr. Keller had less experience than Plaintiff.
- 42. Upon information and belief, St. Gobain, which owns CertainTeed, purchased Continental Building Materials in early 2020.
- 43. Thereafter, upon information and belief, St. Gobain decided to merge CertainTeed and Continental Building Materials, which was completed in March 2020.
 - 44. In mid-April 2020, Plaintiff was told that her position going to be eliminated and

1 she would be furloughed until June 30, 2020. 45. 2 Plaintiff was terminated on or about June 30, 2020. 3 46. In contrast, Mr. Keller, who was promoted after Plaintiff, made more money 4 during his tenure in the same position, and had less experience and tenure with the Company 5 remained as the sole Production Superintendent in Las Vegas. 47. Plaintiff is unaware of any employee furloughed or eliminated in the Las Vegas 6 7 Gypsum plant, other than herself. 8 48. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff's ending salary was approximately 9 \$86,000 per year plus benefits. 49. 10 Plaintiff was an exemplary employee who always fulfilled her job requirements 11 and never had any complaints made against her. 12 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION 13 (Discrimination Based on Sex in violation of State and Federal Statutes) 50. 14 Plaintiff incorporates all of the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein. 15 16 51. Plaintiff is a member of the class of persons protected by state and federal 17 statutes prohibiting discrimination based on sex.

- 52.
- Defendant as an employer is subject to Nevada and federal statutes prohibiting discrimination, Title VII 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3 and NRS 613.330 et. seq., has a legal obligation to provide Plaintiff and all employees with an environment that is free from discriminatory practices.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 53. Defendant refused to take reasonably adequate steps to prevent discrimination against Plaintiff by knowingly favoring employees not of Plaintiff's protected class.
- 54. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff when it failed to treat her the same way as similarly situated employees not of Plaintiff's protected class.
- 55. No other similarly situated persons, not of Plaintiff's protected class were subject to the same or substantially similar conduct.
 - 56. Plaintiff suffered adverse economic impact due to being refused the same

Plaintiff incorporates all of the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as

25 26

66. In violation of 42 U.S.C § 200e-3, Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff after she complained of acts which she reasonably believed were discriminatory.

27 28

67. In violation of NRS 613.340 Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff after she complained of acts, which she reasonably believed were discriminatory.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(Equal Pay Act. Of 1963, 29 U.S.C., Chapter 8 sec. 206(d))

- 75. Plaintiff incorporates all of the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 76. Plaintiff, a female, worked with males in the same or similar position as Plaintiff and in the same workplace.
- 77. Plaintiff received significantly lower compensation for performing the same or similar work as her male counterparts.
- 78. Plaintiff did not receive equal pay to her male counterparts because of her gender.
- 79. Plaintiff and her male counterparts are covered employees as determined under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

1	80. The subjection of Plaintiff to unequal pay is a violation of the EPA.	
2	81. Any employer who violates the provisions of section 215(a)(3) of the EPA shall	
3	be liable for such legal or equitable relief as may be appropriate to effectuate the purposes o	
4	section 215(a)(3), including without limitation employment, reinstatement, promotion, and the	
5	payment of wages lost and an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.	
6	82. Plaintiff seeks damages including but not limited to, lost wages, liquidated	
7	damages for each violation, and attorneys' fees and costs.	
8	83. Plaintiff has been made to suffer mental anguish and emotional distress, loss of	
9	employment opportunities, and loss of wages and benefits, as the direct and proximate result	
10	of Defendant's violation of her civil rights as alleged herein. Plaintiff is reasonably certain to	
11	continue to suffer these damages in the future.	
12	84. Plaintiff is entitled to the rights and remedies at law provided by the EPA	
13	including actual damages, compensatory damages, liquidated damages, and attorneys' fees.	
14	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays this court for:	
15	a. A jury trial on all appropriate claims;	
16	moreover, to enter judgment in favor of the Plaintiff by:	
17	b. Awarding Plaintiff an amount sufficient to fully compensate her (including tax	
18	consequences) for all economic losses of any kind, and otherwise make her	
19	whole in accordance with Title VII and the EPA;	
20	c. General damages;	
21	d. Special damages;	
22	e. An award of compensatory and punitive damages to be determined at trial;	
23	f. Liquidated damages in accordance with the EPA;	
24	g. Pre and post-judgment interest;	
25	h. An award of attorney's fees and costs; and	
26	i. Any other relief the court deems just and proper.	
27		
28	Dated this 29th Day of June, 2021.	

Case 2:21-cv-01219-APG-EJY Document 1 Filed 06/29/21 Page 10 of 10

1	HKM EMPLOYMENT ATTORNEYS, LLP
2	/s/ Jenny L. Foley
3 4	JENNY L. FOLEY, Ph.D., Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9017
	1785 East Sahara, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104
5	Tel: (702) 577-3029
6	Fax: (702) 625-3893 E-mail: jfoley@hkm.com
7	E-mail: jfoley@hkm.com Attorney for Plaintiff
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	